

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-21 are currently pending. Claims 1, 9 and 15 are independent and are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. JP 2000-232458 to Yokogawa et al. (hereinafter, merely “Yokogawa”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0015967 of Sugiura.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 is representative and recites, *inter alia*:

“storage processing of a correspondence relationship between said communication-targeted wireless terminal apparatus and each of said antenna bodies; and

...

at the time of making wireless communication, selection processing of the antenna body that corresponds to the pertinent wireless terminal apparatus

based on the storage processing of the correspondence relationship stored beforehand.” (Emphases added).

As understood by Applicants, Yokogawa describes, in relevant part, the key station sends wireless data to the child offices. In Yokogawa, the key station selects and changes the antenna after a failure in sending the data to the child offices. *See, for example*, Yokogawa par. [0019] (“not having received the confirmation-of-receipt signal”). Because Yokogawa selects and changes the antenna after the failure to send the data, there is a problem with some data transmissions, such as in a television system. That is, Yokogawa has the problem in a television system requiring real-time response, when video sent to the wireless terminal apparatus is disconnected or audio data is interrupted.

In contrast, claim 1 recites, “storage processing of a correspondence relationship between said communication-targeted wireless terminal apparatus and each of said antenna bodies; and . . . at the time of making wireless communication, selection processing of the antenna body that corresponds to the pertinent wireless terminal apparatus based on the storage processing of the correspondence relationship stored beforehand.” That is, in an aspect of the present invention, the wireless communication apparatus sends wireless data to the wireless terminal apparatus, the wireless communication apparatus having selected the optimal antenna before sending the data to the wireless terminal apparatus. Publ. App. pars [0062]-[0069]. See, in particular, Publ. App. par. [0065].

As described in the specification:

“The wireless communication apparatus 1 performs identification processing of the communication-targeted wireless terminal apparatus 400 located within the communication area created by each of the directional

patterns of the antennas 501, 502, storage processing of a correspondence relationship between the communication-targeted wireless terminal apparatus 400 and each of the antennas 501 and 502 or the like, and at the time of making the wireless communication, and performs selection processing of either one of the antennas 501, 502 which corresponds to the pertinent wireless terminal apparatus 400 based on the reading processing of the information stored beforehand.”

Publ. App. par. [0032]. See, *also, for example*, Publ. App. pars. [0040] and [0058].

Claim 1 avoids the problems of Yokogawa, discussed above, by selecting the optimal antenna before sending video data that requires a real-time response to the wireless terminal apparatus.

The Office Action points to Yokogawa paragraph [0012] for the above recited elements of claim 1. However, this is a misinterpretation of Yokogawa. The Office Action resorts to citing a barely understandable machine translation of the Japanese Patent of Yokogawa. A careful reading of suggests Yokogawa describes a base station performs scan processing of inputs of antenna sector units and waits for to receive data. However, the key station only selects and changes the antenna after a failure to send the data to child offices.

The Office Action appears to be speculating as to the meaning of the poor machine translation of Yokogawa paragraph [0012]. The Office Action then uses that speculation to defeat patentability of the present application. Applicants do not have an accurate translation of Yokogawa and do not believe that reference discloses what the Office Action, in hindsight, believes is disclosed. If the Examiner continues to rely on Yokogawa, Applicants suggest an accurate translation of Yokogawa be made of record.

Moreover, Applicants have attached hereto an Abstract of Yokogama. It is clear from the Abstract the master station of Yokogama only switches the antenna after a failure to receive an acknowledge signal from the slave station.

Thus, claim 1 is believed patentable over Yokogawa..

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 9 and 15 are also believed to be patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-21 are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Paul A. Levy
Reg. No. 45,748
(212) 588-0800